<center>**Remarks**</center>

The above Amendments and these Remarks are in reply to the Office Action mailed January 24, 2008.

I.   Summary of Rejections

Claims 10, 24, 26, and 28-51 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §101.

Claims 10, 24, 26, and 28-51 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Glass (U.S. Patent No. 6,993,774) in view of Jones (U.S. Patent No. 6,877,163).

II.   Summary of Applicants' Response

The present Reply amends claims 10, 24, 26, and 29-51, and cancels claim 28, leaving for the Examiner's present consideration claims 10, 24, 26, and 29-51. Reconsideration of the rejections is requested.

III.   Response to Rejections

Claim 10

Claim 10 (as amended) states:

A computer-readable medium storing ~~carrying~~ instructions for processing an invocation at a dynamically generated wrapper, comprising the steps of:

receiving, from an application, an invocation by a wrapper object, the wrapper object instantiated from a wrapper class, the wrapper class extended from a superclass which implements a ~~predefined~~ wrapper interface that includes a pre-invocation handler and a post-invocation handler, the invocation directed to a wrapped resource adapter;

<center>- 9 -</center>

initiating pre-processing by calling a pre-invocation handler configured to execute server-side code wherein the server-side code includes transaction processing code;

calling the wrapped object;

receiving a result from the wrapped object;

initiating post-processing by calling a post-invocation handler configured to execute post processing server-side tasks wherein the post-processing server-side tasks include transaction management; and

providing the result to the application, thereby enabling the application to access vendor specific extension methods of the wrapped resource adapter.

The Office Action rejected Claims 10, 24, 26, and 28-51 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Glass in view of Jones.

The Office Action conceded that Glass does not disclose "initiating pre-processing by calling a pre-invocation handler configured to execute server-side code wherein the server-side code includes transaction processing code" and "initiating post-processing by calling a post-invocation handler configured to execute post processing server-side tasks wherein the post-processing server-side tasks include transaction management." The Office Action asserted however that Jones disclosed these features.

Jones describes a client making a method invocation for a method of an interface implemented by the proxy class. Jones' invocation handler is an object created by the client that is associated with the proxy class instance and processes the request received from the proxy class instance. See Jones col. 3. Jones does not appear to disclose transaction processing. Furthermore, Jones does not disclose a pre-invocation handler configured to execute transaction processing code

- 10 -

and a post-invocation handler wherein post-processing server-side tasks include transaction management.

Applicants respectfully submit that the embodiment as defined in Independent Claim 10 is not obvious in view of Glass and Jones. Applicants respectfully request that the 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) rejection to claim 10 be withdrawn.

Claim 34

Claim 34 requires that "the wrapper object is dynamically generated at runtime by a wrapper factory on an application server." The Office Action cited col. 6, lines 5-23 of Jones as disclosing this feature. The cited portion of Jones describes how a client, after obtaining class objects of desired interfaces, can generate a proxy class for the interfaces by calling a method using the class objects as arguments passed into the method. The cited portion of Jones does not describe a wrapper object being generated by "a wrapper factory on an application server."

Claims 10, 24, 26, and 29-51

Dependent Claims 30-40 depend from Claim 10. For at least the reasons discussed above with regards to Claim 10, dependent claims 30-40 are also patentable. Dependent claims 30-40 add their own limitations which render them patentable in their own right. Independent Claims 24 and 26 and their dependent Claims 29 and 41-51 are also patentable for the reasons above. Independent Claims 10 and 24 and their dependent claims 29 and 41-51 add their own limitations which render them patentable in their own right.

IV.   Conclusion

In light of the above, it is respectfully submitted that all of the claims now pending in the subject patent application should be allowable, and a Notice of Allowance is requested. The Examiner is respectfully requested to telephone the undersigned if he can assist in any way in expediting issuance of a patent.

The Commissioner is authorized to charge any underpayment or credit any overpayment to Deposit Account No. 06-1325 for any matter in connection with this response, including any fee for extension of time, which may be required.

<div align="right">Respectfully submitted,</div>

Date: __April 23, 2008_____   By: __/Thomas K. Plunkett/__
                                           Thomas K. Plunkett
                                           Reg. No. 57,253

Customer No. 23910
FLIESLER MEYER LLP
650 California Street, 14th Floor
San Francisco, California 94108
Telephone: (415) 362-3800
Facsimile: (415) 362-2928

<div align="center">- 12 -</div>